



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,382	09/07/2005	Michel Vogler	Q86474	3947
23373 7590 08/04/2010 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
PAN, HANG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2193				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/525,382

Applicant(s)

VOGLER, MICHEL

Examiner

HANG PAN

Art Unit

2193

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7, 12-17, 19, 24 and 26.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/H. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues Kohl does not teach "an assignment of permissions to the at least one user group with respect to the plurality of data classes, wherein the value of each permission is follow foreign object or own".

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Kohl teaches assignment of "own" permission to a user group with respect to data classes.

The examiner interprets the "own" permission based on the definition of the "own" permission on page 17 of the specification: "own: the permission depends on relations between the current user object and the current data object... E.g. the 'own' relation might be expressed as a direct relation from the user class to the current data class... the generic application engine grants the current user the permission when the user object and the current data object actually are related according to the specified relationships".

Kohl teaches assignment of permission based on a relation between the user class to a data class (column 7, line 51 - column 8, line 10; permissions are defined in ACL, application definition data defines the appropriate "orders" versions for each user or group; so based on relationship defined in the application definition data, each user or group may see a different version of "orders", containing different set of elements; certain users may see data elements which other users do not see based on the relationship defined in application definition data; e.g. elements in the "ship from" column is not available for salespeople in L.A. office).

In the remark, the applicant gives an example of the application "own" permission setting with respect to persons-homes-rentals user class and data classes. This example is merely an embodiment of an application of the "own" permission. The examiner interprets the "own" permission setting based on its definition disclosed in the specification. Under the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner believes Kohl teaches the assignment of "own" permission to a user group with respect to data classes. The details of what "own" might be or could be is not illustrative of what is the basic functionality of the "own" permission setting. In the specification, Applicant details of how "own" could work or might be interpreted as. The usage of "might" in relation to these examples, does not illustrate what own "is" defined to be. The examiner is willing to accept a phone interview to help further prosecution of the case.